

Shebbear (J.)

THE

N

POLE-CAT;

O R,

CHARLES JENNINGS,

THE

Renegado School-Master,

Of *Parson's-Green*, detected.

In a Letter to *Thomas S——n*, Esq;

Hues tu,

Quidam ait, ignoras te? an ut ignotum dare nobis
Verba putas!---Egomet mi ignasco Mænius inquit.
Stultus et improbus hic amor est, dignusque notari.

HORAT. SATIR.

L O N D O N :

Printed in the Year 1783.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE mischiefs which arise to the community from the numerous School-Masters, round London, the most dangerous and detestable of all Swindlers, are so enormous, that, having permission from the writer of the following narrative, to do with it what I please, I resolved to print it, that so flagrant a misconduct, and such proofs of insufficiency may not only be disclosed, respecting the Masters therein mentioned, but that it may awaken the attention of parents, friends and guardians to examine into the conditions of other schools; and even the legislature itself to prevent the enormous evils that are daily engendered in those pernicious seminaries.

Thomas S——n.

Nov.. 1, 1783.

(5)

T H E

POLE-CAT, &c.

S I R,

THERE are few undertakings more painful and discordant to human nature, than that of being obliged to expose such facts as must necessarily lessen the opinion of our understandings. Displeasing as it is I have nevertheless surmounted the reluctance which attends it; and am determined fairly to lay, before you, the errors I have committed in the transaction which I shall relate. My reasons are, that I may, in some degree, atone for the mischief I have caused by inducing you to place your son under the care of Robson and Jennings; to supply you with the means of preventing its farther delatation; that I may do justice to those young gentlemen whose characters Jennings hath attempted to defame; and to him also who so flagitiously and without a cause hath been guilty of that atrocious and unpardonable attempt.

It is well nigh become universal, at present, for those, who are schoolmasters near London, to

B

pretend

pretend to teach what they do not understand. And, as the most pernicious of all swindlers, to defraud the parents of their money and their children of their education. It is evident, therefore, that too much attention cannot be exerted to discover the real abilities of those who have undertaken that charge so important to society.

It being necessary that Charles Le Geyt, my grandson, should be placed under the tuition of some schoolmaster, a friend of mine, whose learning and integrity I have long had and still have reason to esteem, informed me of a school, very lately begun at Parson's Green, by Robson and Jennings, of whom the latter was to undertake the teaching of the learned and modern languages; and that as far as he could discern, from a slight acquaintance with him, he imagined him to be well enough qualified for the undertaking. As there were but very few scholars at their school, and their success must depend on their attention to those they might have, I was induced, by these circumstances, to desire I might see Jennings at my house, and accordingly he came.

To ask a man to construe the languages he presumes to teach, appeared to be somewhat more than good manners would allow. I therefore declined the submitting of him to that trial; and, turning the conversation on ancient literature, I found he talked speciously and seemed to have no contemptible knowledge of the subject. I then asked him of what part of England he was a native, and where he was educated. He told me he was born at Bath, and educated at Oxford. Being dressed like a clergyman, I asked him if he was in orders. He answered, no. I then asked on what account he had neglected to do that, which would, in a great degree, have recommended him as a school-

schoolmaster, and might have led to something better. To this he replied, he had no inclination for the church. I then said, the father of the lad, whom I intended to place under him, was at Berwick; that I must consult him on the matter; and that, on receiving an answer, the result of it should be sent to him. At leaving me he presented the exposition of his plan. On reading this performance I was much disgusted with the bombast and turgidness of his style; the absurdity of his figures; the affectation of modesty in terms which imparted strong proofs of self-sufficiency; a redundancy of words and a scantiness of ideas, together with much ignorance of the English language. However, as I thought myself capable of correcting such errors, should they appear in the translations of my grandson, more especially as I intended he should come to me every Saturday and return the next day, and as I believed his master to possess a sufficient knowledge of the learned languages, after receiving a letter of approbation from captain Le Geyt, I desired to see Jennings. He came, and my grandson, at the age of more than fourteen years, some time after Midsummer, in the last year, was placed under his care.

At this time Jennings requested my recommendation of his school. I told him I lived in retirement and was seldom in company, and therefore I could be of little service to him in the way he requested. But if he thought the naming of my grandson as his scholar could avail him any thing, he was welcome to use it. In this permission consists the great culpability which I have committed. I had some degree of right to decide on the persons who were to educate my grandson, however I might be mistaken: but none to be-

come instrumental in procuring scholars for a man of whose abilities I had so imperfect a knowledge.

For this indiscretion and offence I feel the most sincere contrition and humbly ask pardon, for having been the means of inducing you to send your son under the care of Jennings, and of all those who may have been influenced by my name to have acted in the like manner. And, as you are much in the world, I request that you will shew this letter, or make it public in whatever manner you please, that I may find some extenuation of my crime, and as an unanswerable proof of my not intending to deceive them, that the only being upon earth in whose education I am interested, was sent to the same school with their sons.

The preceding permission was undeviatingly applied by Robson and Jennings. And as it happens that few parents, who are willing to give a learned education to their sons, are capable of deciding on the merits of schoolmasters, from that circumstance when they find that one who may have acquired some reputation, as a man of letters, has placed a young person under the tuition of a master, they conclude that this master must have some degree of learning, and, following the example of him, of whose literature they have a favourable opinion, place their children under his care. From this circumstance Mr. Robson thankfully acknowledged that their school had so greatly increased.

Le Geyt coming from school on Saturdays, I had opportunities of enquiring in what manner Jennings proceeded. And, after some time, I found that his behaviour was diametrically opposite to his plan; and that I had too much reason to imagine myself deceived in the opinion I had formed of him.

him. As the motives that induced me to this change of sentiment are mentioned in my third letter to Jennings, I refer you thither for your satisfaction. I found also that there was great cause of complaint respecting the diet of the boys; that more than half water was mixed with milk for their breakfasts; and that their eternal legs of mutton were brought to table so raw, that none but cannibals could eat a sufficiency of it; this was visibly an artifice to save it for a hash next day. Mrs. Leckie, whose attention to her children does honour to her sex, and deserves the imitation of all mothers, complained of this treatment; and for the future the milk was much less mixed for the biggest four boys, and the proportion of water continued for the rest. The mutton also was more dressed, and the scholars could have a sufficiency. On the preceding occasion, as well as on another, when Jennings instead of the price of twenty-five guineas, as it stands in his plan, had brought in his quarter's bill at the rate of 27 guineas, and Mrs. Leckie remonstrated on his deviating from his own terms; the insolence of Jennings was so excessive that, unless I had interfered in it, her sons would have been taken from the school.

, At this time, when Jennings came to thank me, in bombast terms of grateful acknowledgment, when in conversation he pronounced the words harm, warm, charm, and such like, as harem, warem, charem, I observed he must certainly be a native of Ireland; for no man, born in England, pronounced those words in that manner. To this he made no reply; although he had told me, at my first seeing him, that he was born at Bath.

At the same time speaking French together, I remarked to him, that it was very unusual for a person, bred at Oxford, to speak that language so
gram-

grammatically and with so just a pronuniation as he did. He then said he had learned it in Paris, where he had been three years, to read lectures on the English language. This assertion, though so obviously an untruth, I let pass without animadverting on it. For, how could he possibly have read lectures on the English language to Frenchmen, unless he had made use of their language? From his harem, charem, warem, I conclude he is an Irishman, and from his speaking French so well and the absurdity of the cause that he had assigned for it, that he has been bred in some popish college in France. I thence inferred that he had reneged his country and smuggled his religion; the latter of which is not a little supported by his not having been at divine service at the church of that parish in which he has resided more than sixteen months.

Whenever I enquired into the conduct of Jennings, it was undeviatingly found that the causes for dissatisfaction and repentance increased; for having placed my grandson under him.

Things continued in this manner till, at length, Le Geyt, on the 19th of August, came from school, and informed me, that he had been twice struck by Jennings with his Fist, and treated with the most abusive language. That after the first insult, Mr. Robson had prevailed on him not to acquaint me with it; but on this second, he was resolved, notwithstanding Robson's endeavour to dissuade him, to inform me of it. But even at this time he abstained from relating the barbarity with which he had been treated.

Two days after this event Robson came to me to apologize for Jennings's ill-treatment. He assured me the cause of it was what my grandson had told me, that by the laws of Jennings's fabrication the penalty for the offence was that of eating
water.

water-gruel for a few meals instead of other diet; that Le Geyt had said, by the laws that was his punishment, and he was ready to comply with it. Notwithstanding which that Jennings persisted to strike him with his Fist; and that his language had been scandalously abusive. He assured me, that the permission of using my name had been the great cause of their school's increase, and that removing Le Geyt must inevitably be of great detriment to them. He therefore intreated, that my grandson might return, and assured me, that he would take particular care that he should receive no more such treatment. He agreed also that, by such proceedings, Jennings must inevitably ruin the school and him. I acquiesced with Le Geyt's returning.

Previous to the coming of Robson, I had written, but not sent, the subsequent letter. I read it to Robson. He approved of it, and it was sent to Jennings.

Sir,

I Am truly displeased with the subject of this letter. Yet, as it is of a nature that ought not to be passed without notice, I shall freely give you my sentiments upon it: and not the less willingly because I think it of the highest importance to your welfare, that no more such occasions be given to any one to complain of your treatment.

In your proposals you appear to have the greatest aversion from brutally correcting scholars. This has undoubtedly been a motive to parents to send their children under your care: and yet, in your practice you seem to pay too little attention to that laudable mode of conducting a school. Thus whilst you have given proofs that you know what ought to be done,

done, you have afforded instances that you are either unable or unwilling to carry it into execution: and, with an understanding equal to your undertaking, that your temper will not permit you to exercise it as you ought. You invite in theory and avert by practice; and whilst you are collecting materials to erect an edifice, you destroy the cement which should hold them together.

I am informed you have framed a code of scholastic laws, and annexed the penalties to the several offences which your scholars may commit. Those laws they ought to obey or be punished for their transgressions; but then these institutes are a compact between you and them reciprocally established as a common ground of behaviour, and are as obligatory on the master, who is to govern, as on the boys, who are to obey: and that legislator, who exceeds the laws which he himself hath instituted, is as much a tyrant, as any of his scholars can be rebels, who may disregard them. These you certainly have infringed.

Is a Fist a proper instrument with which a master, who has undertaken the task of a liberal education, should correct a scholar? and I now hear you have twice applied to that method of correcting my grandson, in violation of your own rules, which have affixed the punishment for the offence that Charles had committed.

A competency of learning is undoubtedly necessary to a man who has undertaken the education of young persons; but whatever may be the degree of it, an intemperance of passion will not only render the application of his literature less effectual, but even teach, by example, what ought not to be seen in that person who has chosen to set himself at the head of instructing others. Is the precedent of temperance less advantageous to youth

youth than that of science in those who teach them?

But it is not solely in your mode of correcting my grandson that you have dishonoured that character of instructing others, which you have assumed. You have called him low-lived, ill-bred, mean fellow, rascal, scoundrel, and cowardly dog. Now, without intending to disparage your birth or origin, (which I nothing know, I shall presume to tell you, he is not more a low-lived, mean fellow, a rascal, scoundrel, and cowardly dog than yourself: and as to ill-breeding, it would give me the greatest pain to know that he had afforded so signal a specimen of it, as you have exhibited in the preceding language. If decency of manners and propriety of expression be requisite in those who are to instruct young persons, have you not egregiously exceeded that liberal deportment?

And now, having fully imparted my sentiments on this matter, I am to tell you, that it is not correction, but an injudicious and intemperate application of it that I disapprove. — By your laws your scholars are acquainted with the offences and penalties which are to be consecutive of them. When they offend their punishment is therefore just, provided it be that which the law enjoins. But if you ordain one punishment and inflict another, it is unjust, tyrannic, and extremely reprehensible; and you evince that you are as little fit to govern as they are to obey.

I have always wished that you might succeed in your undertaking, and it is for that reason, more than for any other, that I have taken the trouble of writing so long a letter. Let me give you the advice that the experience of more than seventy years will warrant to be beneficial. Let not the

lightening of your passions blast the blossom of that spring which is so promising of a fruitful harvest.

I am, &c.

J. Shebbeare.

Aug. 21, 1783.

A few days after the date of the preceding letter Le Geyt returned to Parsons-Green. Jennings returned no answer to it; but said to Le Geyt, he would call on me, and that there were three bulls in my letter. This letter is as it was sent to him; and I leave you, Sir, to determine whether these hulls are in the letter or in his Numskull. This mannerly assertion was intended, as I imagine, to depreciate me in the opinion of my grandson; and as an intimation that the letter, which he could not answer, was not worth answering. However, since that time, the consciousness of his delinquency, and the fear of reprehension, have withheld him from calling on me.

Some time after this affair, my grandson informed me, that a person named Trevanion, was made usher to the school. That he came in very mean apparel, literally with a bare backside, his breeches being worn into a large hole behind; and that he had but one shirt, and a piece; the latter of which he wore while the former was washing, that, nevertheless, he boasted of his being bred at Eton; of having taken the degree of Master of Arts at Oxford; of having had the sons of Noblemen and members of Parliament under his care; that he was born in Cornwall; that he was of an ancient and wealthy family and had a relation who was a member of parliament. In this account of Trevanion the other scholars agreed with Le Geyt, and that he was arrogant and beat the boys

boys as Jennings continued to do; that he was universally detested by the scholars, and encouraged by Jennings in his insolence and brutality. Mentioning the name of Trevanion as an usher at Jennings's school, to the gentleman who was the cause of my knowing the latter, he said, that this Trevanion had begged of Mr. Betterworth, who had given him a half crown in charity.

Of all the preceding account, which Trevanion gave of himself, I know nothing; but that the family of Trevanion is, as he said, ancient, rich and respectable, and from thence I drew an inference, diametrically opposite to that which he had intended by his boasting. That no man of that name educated, as he said he had been, could have been reduced to rags and beggary, had not his conduct been totally indefensible. And in this inference I now know I am fully justified.

From the perfect intimacy and equality which appeared between him and his master, from the first moment of his coming into the house, I concluded that their acquaintance had not begun at that time; and therefore that something similar might have been the case with Jennings: and this circumstance did not increase my opinion in favour of the latter.

Notwithstanding the raggedness of Trevanion's breeches, I did not thence conclude, that he was neither a scholar nor a wit. I know that John Phillips, who was both, describes himself in a like situation in the following lines:

*My galligaskins that have long withstood
The winter's fury and encroaching frosts
By time subdued, that will not time subdue,
A horrid chasm disclose wide discontinuous,
At which the winds Eurus and Anster and*

*The dreadful force of Boreas that congeals
The Chironian waves tumultuous enter.*

But although I did not conclude that a ragged pair of breeches precluded the wearer from being a scholar or a wit, yet, I did not from thence infer that he who had no whole breeches must consequently be a scholar or a wit. And in this instance, I find myself not mistaken respecting Trevanion, who resembles John Phillips in nothing but his galligaskins; and now even that resemblance of a wit and a scholar is totally lost by his backside being secured from the fury of the winds above-mentioned by a new pair of breeches.

My opinion of his wit is founded on what appears in Jennings's letter to me, to the wit, good sense, good manners and good English of which Trevanion contributed all he had, as he has confessed by saying, we have written him a letter, meaning Jennings and himself by the we. My opinion of his scholarship is grounded on his being obliged to preconstitute those lessons, even in Cæsar's Commentaries, in which he is immediately to hear the boys; but what he wants in learning he supplies with impudence, though in due subordination, as an usher should, to his master. The hours of school vacation were spent by these wights in sublime compliments on each other's literary excellence, and in traducing the parents of those children who are under their tuition. From these circumstances and from those that will be related in my answer to Jennings's letter, both the master and the usher were become the contempt and jest of every school-boy who was more than twelve years of age. Such being the case I resolved to find some other school for my grandson, and to assign my reasons for removing him to the parents
and

and friends of those boys who had been sent to Parson's Green through my influence. In this, however, I was prevented by Jennings.

On Tuesday the 30th of September, master Goodison and Le Geyt came to my house, and said, that Jennings had dismissed them from school. I asked on what account; they answered, they had given no cause, and that Jennings had not presumed to assign any. I then wrote him the following letter.

Sir,

I Am this moment informed that you have dismissed master Goodison and my grandson from your school. My surprize is the greater on this event, because, in all such cases, it is usual for masters previously to acquaint the parents of those children under their care with the misbehaviour of such as they intend to dismiss. As you have neglected to proceed in that manner, I cannot but suppose that the two young gentlemen above-mentioned, must have committed some egregious misconduct, or you could not have behaved as you have done. To be dismissed from school naturally tends to throw an unfavourable light on the characters of the boys so treated. I therefore desire and expect you will favour me with an account of those actions which have so apparently drawn disgrace on my grandson.

I have read this letter to Mr. Goodison, and he joins in the same request with me.

I am, &c.

Sept. 30, 1783.

J. Shebbeare.

On master Goodison and Le Geyt's being dismissed, the two masters Leckie immediately left the

the school, and repaired to their mother, at Brompton Grove, when, on their relating the affair and assuring her that there was no cause for the dismissal of their school-fellows, Mrs. Leckie resolved to withdraw her sons immediately from the tuition of a man so precipitate and imprudent, lest the same ignominious treatment might be their lot also.

On the day of the dismissal, Jennings came to Mrs. Leckie's, and finding she was not at home, returned in the evening with his man Trevanion, and then, for the third time, so atrociously exhibited his ill-manners, that he was commanded to leave the house. But apprehending, as I suppose, that his impudence might deserve a proper dismissal by the servants, he had prepared himself with a stick that conceals a sword, which he furiously brandished, during his vociferous audacity, to Mrs. Leckie. Whachum behaved with more decency than Sidrophel, his master.

The next day Mr. Goodison being informed that Jennings had been twice at Mrs. Leckie's, without calling on him or me, became impatient to hear what he had to offer in palliation of his conduct. He therefore determined to go to Parsons Green; and requested that Mrs. Leckie and I would accompany him. To this we agreed. We immediately repaired to the school, taking with us the two young Leckies and the two who had been dismissed. On entering the house and asking of a maid servant whether Mr. Jennings was at home, she answered, yes. We then went into the parlour. After about ten minutes waiting, Mrs. Jennings made her appearance, and said, Mr. Jennings was not at home. We then asked for Robson, who came and assured us that Jennings was gone to London, which was then true. For,
dreading

dreading to face the relations of those whom he had so flagitiously treated, he had sneaked off like a mongrel detected in the act of sheep-biting, to avoid the being exposed to the ridicule, contempt and criminality of not being able to answer such questions as he was conscious would be asked him relative to his conduct.

Mr. Robson, on being asked, positively affirmed, that there was no cause for dismissing either Master Goodison or Le Geyt ; and that he did not consent to it. After reprobating the conduct of Jennings and insisting on an answer to my last letter, we returned, and the next day I received the following letter.

Sir,

WHY will you extort unpleasing truths from me ? Why will you force me to say, that your surprize at Mr. Le Geyt's dismissal and your ignorance of the cause of it are equally affected ? have you not infused into him a contempt of literary excellence ? have you not fostered all his youthful passions, and prompted him to acts not only of disobedience but of personal insult ?

Pity, however, for your age and infirmities directs me to suppress all farther details. I most sincerely wish that habitual pride and self-conceit may not hinder you from profiting by advice the tendency of which is to mitigate your own tortures, and to lessen the pangs of expiring malignity. Tho' you have hitherto valued yourself for imitating the scorpion, by spreading your poison indiscriminately, do not in the last stage of being close the resemblance by turning the baneful sting upon yourself, and miserably exhibiting in your own person, at once the assailant and the sufferer.

I hope

I hope you have read to Mr. Goodison your former as well as your latter letter, that he may be enabled to judge of this reply to both.

Your's

Charles Jennings.

Parson's Green, Thursday.

It seems strange what could have induced him to return an answer, so mendacious and abusive, to my letters, in which there is not a syllable that can provoke such outrage in any man who is not insane; or what, as a grandfather, it was not indispensibly my duty to write, and my right to have answered? Was I silently to acquiesce with his impudent attempt to fix an infamy on Master Goodison and my Grandson, without being satisfied of the cause of it? Is the most atrocious impudence, in Jennings, to be received as a justification of indefensible and rascally conduct? Is there another miscreant to be found who possesses the effrontery to behave in so flagitious a manner? Will parents and guardians, should they be acquainted with his infamous behaviour, permit those boys, whom they may have sent to his school, to be exposed to the danger of being disgraced, and themselves insulted and traduced, at the will of so flagitious, so ignorant and so despicable a Renegado, Rapparee adventurer?

As Jennings had asserted that I was not ignorant of the cause which had produced the dismissal of Le Geyt, and had suggested, in his question, what he intended should be received as positive truths, that I had infused into him a contempt of literary excellence, fostered his passions and prompted him to disobedience and personal insult; I thought it incumbent on me to refute his impudence: For had I silently acquiesced in this outrage on my cha-

character, I should deservedly have been considered as guilty of the preceding charges, which, though criminal in all men, are little less that execrable in a grandfather to his grandson. I, therefore, determined to return him an answer. And as to have used reserve, after so flagrant and so unprovoked an insult as his letter, would have been the most abject absurdity, I resolved he should see himself in the delineation I intended to give. Accordingly, I wrote the following letter.

S I R,

IN my letter to you, of the 30th of September; I desire you will favour me with an account of those actions which have so apparently drawn disgrace on my grandson; and in your reply, to this unexceptionable request, you begin in that bombast which is so singularly conspicuous in the exposition of your plan, with these words. “Why will you extort unpleasing truths from me! Why will you force me to say that your surprize at Mr. Le Geyt’s dismissal and the ignorance of the cause of it are equally affected?”

Previous to my writing the letter you mention, I strictly enjoined Master Goodison and Le Geyt to explain the cause which could have induced you to dismiss them, they both assured me, they knew of none. Since that time, I have requested Mr. Robson, your superior in the paternership, to tell me, if he knew of any cause for the dismissal of Le Geyt. On this request, in the presence of Mrs. Leckie, Mr. Goodison, and several others, he assured me, that there was no cause for the dismissal either of Master Goodison or Le Geyt; and that it was done without his consent. Now tell me in what manner my surprize and ignorance could

D

have

have been affected, unless I could have discovered such causes as had never existed? and which, if they had existed, nothing but the most egregious idiotism could have withheld you from adducing. Thus, instead of my extorting unpleasing truths from you, and forcing you to say that my surprize and ignorance were affected, is it not fully evinced, that, having no reasons to assign in your defence, you have spontaneously added the impudence of a lie to your rascality in the dismissal of my grandson? You proceed “ have you not infused into him a contempt of literary excellence? “ have you not fostered all his youthful passions “ and prompted him to acts not only of disobedience, but of personal insult?” In this manner, instead of returning such answers and arguments as might tend to justify your behaviour, you have positively asserted one lye, and asked three questions that are founded on equal falsehoods. Is it not, therefore, evident either that you cannot distinguish an interrogatory from an answer? or, that having no reasons to support your audaciousness, you have endeavoured to evade the impossibility of bringing them? But notwithstanding you have so sneakingly skulked from returning an answer to my reasonable question, I shall nevertheless indulge you with an answer to all that you have so impudently asked, to all which I most firmly and truly reply, that I have never spoken a single word, nor committed the least act, that can possibly support you in your infamous suggestion; and I defy you to adduce, a single instance, one excepted which I shall give you before I close this letter, on which to ground your mendacious questions. And with but one fact to support you, which, when known, you dare not to apply, is it not a most flagrant act of effrontery to have asked them?

them? Would you have had recourse to such an unprecedented and unprovoked exertion of your impudence, unless you had been totally devoid of argument? for, what can exceed the impudence of asking questions lyingly to suggest that so near a relation, as a grandfather, hath infused into his grandson, a contempt of literary excellence, fostered his passions and prompted him to acts of disobedience and personal insult? Am I not therefore fully justified in asserting that no such behaviour hath existed: and that you are the most flagitiously audacious of all those bipeds that have disgraced humanity? Was it not with the same malignant design to blacken my character by lying insinuations, as you had endeavoured to throw disgrace on that of my grandson by your causeless dismissal? Is this the mode in which you intend to treat your scholars and their parents? Are characters to be thus insolently defamed, by one whose understanding is so contemptible and whose situation is so mean? Do you imagine this ignominious attempt shall pass with impunity?

But to omit no means by which your ignominious conduct may be placed in the truest light, let the falsehoods you have suggested in your interrogations, be considered as truths; and then let us see what will be the issue of that concession? for without your being able to adduce one instance of contempt for learning, disobedience, or insult in my grandson what cause could you have had for dismissing him in a manner so scandalous to yourself and so unmerited by him? and if there had existed any reason which could have palliated your transgression, would Mr. Robson, whose interest is so closely and so fatally connected with your own, have neglected to offer it in extenuation of your infamous behaviour?

Thus having fairly and fully replied to your questions, I shall proceed to question you: and I expect, as unequivocal and true replies as I have given you. Is it possible that you can believe, that, I, who have passed the greatest part of my life in literary pursuits, and have, at all times, manifested the greatest estimation for learning, can have infused into a youth, so near and dear to me as a grandson, a contempt for literary excellence? and that I can have fostered his passions, and prompted him to acts of disobedience and personal insult, when such culpable dispositions must of necessity be so disgraceful and ruinous in him; and the infusing of them so criminal and scandalous in me? and now which will you prefer? will you choose to be deemed so credulous and ignorant as in reality to believe the falsehoods you have suggested? or, of such malignancy of soul, which, disdaining truth, decorum and integrity, hath goaded you to overleap all bounds of probability, common sense and good manners?

And now I will generously afford you the sole instance, in my life, by which it can possibly be supposed that I have conducted myself in the criminal manner you have suggested. It is that of being instrumental in the committing of my grandson to your tuition. For, if you believe that I have infused into him a contempt for literary excellence, fostered his passions, and prompted him to acts of disobedience and insult, on what grounds can you conceive that, at the expence of more than thirty guineas a year, he has been placed under your direction, unless it be for the sake of his being perfected, by your ignorance, instructions, impudence, and example in that contempt? and by the outrageousness of your passions, your disobedience to the dictates of reason, your insults on common sense

sense and common decency, and your brutality of behaviour to be confirmed in the habitude of such criminal and degrading dispositions? for if these were not my reasons for his being placed under your care, you make me guilty of the most absurd of all contradictions, that of being at a great expence to defeat the very ends which, as you so probably suggest, I propose in his education. And certainly if you will deign to examine your abilities and propensity to accomplish them, in spite of the singularity of your modesty, you cannot but acknowledge that I have marvelously succeeded in selecting you for his master. And if you are possessed of one grain either of grace or gratitude, will you not thank me for discovering the sole employment to which your talents are adapted?

I am now to consider you in the compassionate regard you shew me, you say "Pity however, for your age and infirmities directs me to suppress all farther details." Do you know that detail signifies a minute and particular account? Have you attempted any such account of me? how can the continuation of a detail be suppressed that was never begun? Does not this blunder announce the country from whence you came? Is it not extremely ridiculous, that you should presume to teach a language the words of which you do not understand? Of this I will give you other instances before I have finished this letter.

But to convince you that I am as ready to acknowledge, that you can occasionally speak truth, as to shew your general propensity to lying, I confess that an age of more than seventy three years, and the gout which has afflicted me more than half of that time, have brought upon me many infirmities of body; or before this you should have received that chastisement which you so righteously deserve. As

to the infirmities of my mind, I flatter myself that age hath not reduced them to an imbecility that is not superior to the full vigour of your abilities: for a decision of which I appeal to a comparison between your letter and mine.

I cannot, however, but thank you for that pity which you express for my infirmities. And yet, I am persuaded, you would have acted as judiciously in reserving it for your own. I mean your ignorance, your self-sufficiency, your vanity, your insufficiency, your bombast style, your illiberality, indecency, and ingratitude; your disregard of truth and recourse to falsehood, the brutality of treating your scholars and your wife; for I am too credibly informed to doubt its veracity, that you not unfrequently exercise, what, in your laws, you so elegantly style a mutton fist, for the correction of your spouse, as well as of your scholars. Thus whilst, by these laudable examples, you are instructing your scholars, in what manner they are to behave to those who are under them when single, you kindly add in what manner they are to conduct themselves when married. By the former you evince your judgement in governing a school; and by the latter your tenderness in governing a wife. Hence it is evident that boys have a double advantage in being educated under you. An advantage so singular, that I am bold to say, is not to be found in any other School in England. Thus you see, in return for your pity, how willingly I am disposed to exhibit not only your literary, but your matrimonial excellence.

Having done with your pity I shall proceed to your wish. You tell me "you most sincerely wish
 " that habitual pride and self-conceit may not hinder me from profiting by advice, the tendency
 " of which is to mitigate my own tortures and to
 " les-

"lessen the pangs of expiring malignity." I confess I have some suspicions of the sincerity of this wish. However, after your presumption to know, what has passed in my mind, respecting my conduct towards my grandson, you give us a repetition of your insolence in presuming to pronounce the sensations which are lodged in my Heart; in both which you are perfectly mistaken. And if pride and self-conceit be habitual in me, why have you neglected to adduce such instances of them, as might mitigate the impudence of that charge? and if you will but allow, what seems not to be unreasonable, that I can feel for myself, as well as you can for me; I do assure you, with as much varacity in the assertion as there is falsehood in all that you have written, that I have neither tortures to mitigate, nor pangs to lessen. These, I fancy, if they are not already, will soon be too poignant in your breast for medicine to assuage, or repentance to obliterate: and if my malignity be expiring will not my pangs and tortures go along with it? What need therefore, for your wish? And if by my malignity expiring you mean myself, short as my life may be, if you have sense sufficient to discern the despicable situation to which you have reduced yourself, I shall live long enough to hear that you have followed the example of Judas Iscariot, which, as my malignity does not desire, pray let all ropes and halters be kept from your sight.

What indications of malignity have you perceived in me, equal to that of insidiously dragging my grandson backwards from the form on which he sat, dashing his head twice on the floor, and then kneeling on one knee, the more forcibly to exert your malice, giving him one blow under the chin, and with your knuckle forcing him to the
ground

ground with such violence, that his breast was so bruised so as to remain black for several days? and all this without being able to assign the least cause for this outrage. This you have had the effrontery to commit in full contradiction to what you so turgidly declare in the exposition of your plan. In that you say, " Let the advocates for *birch* re-
 " present in as frightful colours as a splenetic
 " imagination can conceive, the early vices of
 " youth, their levity, impatience of confinement
 " and disrelish for the indispensable necessity of
 " stripes in all well-disciplined seminaries, their
 " spleen, their sophistry and artificial rhetoric will
 " not be able to overturn the evidence of this sa-
 " cred truth, *that man is a creature from whom*
 " *every thing may be obtained by love, nothing truly*
 " *valuable by the savage expedients of force and fear.*"

And now, after the savage acts which you have committed, is it possible that you, the most audacious of all beings that ought to be ranked in the human species, can possess the effrontery to look the preceding paragraph in the face? have you not by your practice given the lye to your plan, committed sacrilege on the sacredness of truth, and proved that you are absolutely unqualified to teach and govern boys on your own principles, and indisputably that you are a liar in theory, a hypocrite in your expressions and an assassin in your soul?

Was it through malignity that, when your school consisted solely of the son of a farrier, the son of a gentleman's butler, and one more, that I became the means of so remarkably increasing it, by the addition of all those gentlemens sons it has hitherto received, or will ever receive, after this detection of your savageness, ignorance and effrontery, if parents and guardians have not
 aban-

abandoned all care for the education and treatment of such boys as they may send to school?

Was it an act of malignity that when you were so justly reprehended by Mrs. Leckie, for the badness of the dyet which you gave your scholars, and she would have taken them from your ill-treatment, and you had so causelessly treated her with the most atrocious insolence and ill-manners; that, in commiseration of what must have fallen on you, as I had been the sole motive of their being sent to your school, I became the means of their continuing with you? in what bombast terms of hypocritic gratitude and servile humility did you then profess the eternal sense which you should cherish in your heart for the immense service which I had done you; how truly you have realized the sincerity of your intention by the savageness of your treatment I have already shewn. Even at the moment of your pomposity in expressing your eternal gratitude, I predicted, that if ever you succeeded in your undertaking your insolence, in futurity, would be equal to your present abjectness; and now that prediction is fully verified.

You continue. " Though you have hitherto
 " valued yourself for imitating the scorpion by
 " spreading your poisons indiscriminately, do
 " not in the last stage of being close the resemblance by turning the baneful sting upon yourself, and, miserably exhibiting in your own person, at once the assailant and the sufferer."
 What instances can you bring of my indiscriminately spreading poisons? How many poisons does a scorpion contain? Does that little animal, so like yourself, except in your being stingless, spread its poisons indiscriminately, with a small sting, as a plasterer does his mortar with a trowel? Had you any ideas annexed to the words scorpion, sting, and

E

spreading

spreading, when you used them? Should not he who pretends to teach a language understand it? However, if I have a sting it is not in my tail; and that you have no sting either in head or tail is evident, from the excrementitious matter which you eject, in imitation of the pole-cat, that, on being pursued, discharges its ordure, in hopes of averting his pursuers by the stink; which, though it be extremely nauseous, is not poison: and, instead of turning my sting upon myself, I will reserve it for you. In what other person than himself can a man at once be an assailant and a sufferer? I will not assail myself, but persevere in making you the sufferer.

Pray inform me whether, by your expression, "the last stage of being," I am to conclude it is your creed that, after this life, the soul hath no existence: or that you do not comprehend the terms you use? if it be the former, teach the doctrine of the soul's annihilation after death; and then the principles of your philosophy will be a complete companion to your grammatical instructions; and then your pupils will be as accomplished in the tenets of religion, as in the knowledge of the languages, when they leave your school. If it be the latter, is it not unpardonable that you have not even Entick's School Dictionary in your library, which is so necessary to a master who pretends to teach the English, which he does not understand?

What a blessed resemblance have you drawn between me and a scorpion? Can its aptitude be equalled, by any thing, but by that delicious figure in your exposition, "forcing upon boys a "nauseous draught of grammar jargon." How long has jargon been drinkable? What jargon hath grammar? How nicely you observe similitude in
your

your comparisons and preservation in your metaphors ! Is it not necessary that two languages, at least, should be understood by those who presume to teach translation ? Have you not afforded irrefragable proofs, in your short letter, that you cannot write English as you ought to ? and if you understand the learned languages to that degree in which they are known by common schoolmasters, what occasion can there be that every morning and evening, under the pretext of study, you tarry one hour in what you denominate your library, in which there are no books but such as you tell to your boys, but, in reality, to learn those lessons in which you are to instruct your scholars ? This precaution, although it can afford no evidence of the excellence of your literature, is undoubtedly an instance of your prudence. For a schoolmaster would be even more ridiculous than you are, should he undertake to teach his scholars those lessons which he had not learned himself.

And now you say, " I hope you have read to Mr. Goodison my former as my latter letter, that he may thereby be enabled to judge of this reply to both." I have not only read, but given him copies of both the letters you allude to : as I shall of your's and this I am writing ; and I will give you his opinion, on your epistle. It is, that he holds the ignorance, the impudence, bombast and falsehood which it contains in the utmost contempt ; and that it is no more a reply to either of mine than it is to the Life and Adventures of Robinson Crusoe.

As in my letter I have told you that Mr. Goodison requested an account from you, in justification of your dismissing his son, in the words " a reply to both, considering your native propensity to blundering ; and that you have condescended to

give him no answer, may it not be understood as a reply to both him and me? for it cannot be more singular in you to imagine you have given a reply, where you have returned no answer, than to think you have answered my letter by asserting one egregious falsehood, and asking three audacious questions; and that you would have Mr. Goodison to infer, that his son was dismissed on the account of what you have so mendaciously averred and suggested to have been done by Le Geyt's grandfather. Are you not a pretty fellow practically to inculcate the art of reasoning by a demonstration of Euclid's Elements? And now, although I have done with your letter, I shall nevertheless persist in asking you the following questions, to which I have a right to require unequivocal and explicit answers: not only because I have given such to you, but that I may thereby, if possible, be somewhat enabled to alleviate the guilt of that sin which I committed in recommending you as a schoolmaster. Did you not tell me that you were born at Bath? Have I not just reason to doubt the truth of it? Did ever a man, born on this side the Irish sea, pronounce the words harm, charm, warm, farm, term, firm, form, as harem, charem, warem, farem, terem, firem, forem? and when, on observing this manner of your pronouncing them, I said you were certainly an Irishman, why did you silently acquiesce with that observation, if you had been born at Bath? not that I entertain the least objection to your being an Irishman; but to your being a renegado of that country, which hath so much reason to be ashamed of you, not you of Ireland.

What an effrontery must you possess, who, in such barbarous pronunciation, presume to teach your scholars to read the English language, and with an emphasis, laid on the words, as
forcibly

forcibly and loud as a brazier lays his strokes on his anvil, with distortions of body resembling a demoniac, and such an affectation of cadence as converts your reading into such ridicule that the youngest boy in the school cannot prevent the muscles of his face from running into laughter?

Did you not tell me, you were bred at a celebrated grammar school and finished your education at Oxford? have I not just reason, from your ignorance and illiberality, to suspect the truth of it? Tell me then in what country and at what school you were taught the rudiments of grammar; at what age you went to the university abovementioned; in what college you were entered; and whether you took any and what degrees?

Are you not *un moine defrocké*? be honest for once, and tell the truth.

But I will be more kind to you than you have a right to expect, and supply you with reasons for your impudent dismissal of the young gentlemen abovementioned. You were conscious that your ignorance, your impudence, your falsehoods, your brutality and all those other qualities which degrade, not only the character of a schoolmaster but human nature itself, would be by them discovered and exposed to Mr. Goodison and me; and then that we could not, with any degree of common sense, continue them under your tuition. You, therefore, determined to dismiss them as culpable, in order to prevent the disgrace which must have fallen upon you by their being taken from your school, with hopes of keeping the sons of Mrs. Leckie, and those whom she had recommended. But in this you have been most egregiously mistaken. She had been too long acquainted with your insolence and ill-manners to give the least credit to any thing you could offer.

And

And now I shall leave you, for the present, and and as kindly conclude my letter with advice to you, as you have your's to me, and with one question. I, therefore, most sincerely advise, that you and your shirtless usher, do daily divert yourselves, like two jack-asses, with nabbing one another, because of all employments it is that which is most peculiarly adapted to your capacities, and to exemplify your literary excellence: but as you cannot be supposed to employ your whole time in this practical study, I shall favour you with a short song, with which you may amuse yourselves between the acts. The second and third lines are equally applicable to both of you; the first and last to you alone.

*Madam O'Neale is the flower of the flock,
And Madam O'Neale had never a smock;
Never a smock to cover her tail,
The world's well mended with Madam O'Neale.*

And now for the question. Were it in your power to choose, would not you prefer the being tossed, like Sancho, in a blanket, to the writing of that letter which has been productive of this answer?

I am, &c.

J. Shebbeare.

P. S. I ask pardon of your usher for using the epithet of shirtless. For, how can a gentleman be shirtless who hath as many shirts as were possessed by Falstaff's whole company of Raggamuffins.

Oct. 10, 1783.

On the Saturday, after the dismissal, master Maitland returned from school to captain Crook-thanks,

shanks, who had placed him under the care of Robson and Jennings, when he gave some account of what had happened at this school. And as on that day I dined with the captain, I related what I had heard from both the dismissed. On this captain Crookshanks determined to suspend the return of young Maitland, until he had heard what every party, concerned in this affair, might have to offer. In consequence of this resolve, on the Monday he waited on Mr. Goodison and Mrs. Leckie, from whom he received the same intelligence he had from me.

Being determined, however, to omit no circumstance that could tend to give a full explanation of the matter, he went to Parson's-Green, and enquired into the whole affair from Jennings. After this Jennings and Robson separately waited on captain Crookshanks. The result of all this was, after the strictest investigation of the matter, that neither Jennings nor Robson had been able to assign any cause for the dismissal of the two young gentlemen abovementioned.

Satisfied, therefore, that Jennings had behaved in an indefensible manner, of his unprovoked intolerance in his letter to me of his brutality in having knocked down master Maitland with his fist, he concluded that he was absolutely improper to superintend a liberal education, and withdrew master Maitland from his school. Jennings, on his first seeing captain Crookshanks, had said, he had been bred at University College, in Oxford.

Before the preceding letter was sent, Robson came to my house with design to soften the just resentment which Jennings had scandalously excited. I asked him if he had seen my letter to Jennings, requesting he would transmit me an account of the transgressions which had produced the dismissal of

of the two young gentlemen, and Jennings's answer. He replied he had seen neither of them. I then read them both. At this he expressed himself, with astonishment, at the impudence of Jennings's letter, and at what, in my letter could possibly have produced it. At this time also he confirmed what he had said to me in the presence of Mrs. Leckie, Mr. Goodison and others, "that there was no cause for " dismissing Le Geyt." I asked him also for something, under his hand, by which to certify that the dismissal of my grandson was without cause. He answered that he was then come from Mr. Goodison, and had already given something of that kind to him in which Le Geyt was included and fully exculpated. He then repeated the sense of what he said he had written, and which was as fully a justification of one as the other: But said I you must give it me, under your hand, that I may transmit it to his father in Jersey. This he promised most faithfully he would do in a letter from Parson's Green, and in both these assertions he has proved himself an egregious liar.

I asked him if Jennings was bred at Oxford, he assured me he was, and educated at University College, that Dr. Scot was his tutor and that he had taken a degree in that university. Notwithstanding this affirmation, my doubts, respecting the falsehood of that account were not removed.

I then asked by what means he became acquainted with Jennings. He answered, in consequence of an advertisement for an usher, when he kept a day school in Jarvis Street, that Jennings had come and solicited the employment. I then asked in what manner he appeared respecting his apparel, he replied, much as those, who are in search of being ushers, usually do; and that he lodged somewhere in Westminster, but in what
part

part he knew not. To this he added, I hope you will not expect me to answer any more questions concerning Mr. Jennings. I therefore desisted : because I saw that he was reduced to the painful alternative, either of lying to conceal what he chose not to discover; or to reveal such truths as must tend to expose what he wished to remain in eternal darkness.

Such are the two persons who in their plan, have told us that, "A course of Latin and Greek studies must now be regulated;" a slip into nonsense so common with these language masters. For who has ever heard of a Latin or Greek study? Should it not have been a course of studying the Latin and Greek? he continues "not only with a view to improve and perfect the learners in those languages," in which learners he himself is included as well as his scholars, as it has been and will be immediately shewn. "But also to methodize and discriminate their ideas," in words of which Jennings knows not the signification. "To arrange in proper order the materials of knowledge;" by knowing nothing of the matter. "And to form his taste for composition," for the performance of which the bombast and fustian style, together with the absurd arrangement of their exposition, are unanswerable proofs of their abilities.

Two days after Robson had been with me, Trevannion, for it was his clean shirt day, came to my house. I asked his name and his business. He told me the former; and that the latter was to know why I had abused his character. As I had been well informed of some insolences which he had shewn respecting me, I shortly answered, it was false, and required an instance. He replied that I had said, he had not two shirts, and that he could prove the contrary. I then asked him if his

character lay in his shirts, and added, if it did I believed, it was but slender and not very clean. Here rested the affair of the shirts. He then said it was illiberal in Mr. Bettsworth to disclose, and in me to repeat, that he had begged; and that the latter had given him a half crown. I answered that I saw nothing illiberal in saying that a beggar had begged and received charity. To this he replied, there were many scholars, who were poor whose characters were nevertheless unimpeachable. To which I answered, there were indeed too many scholars who were undeservedly in indigence. But how a Trevannion, who, I knew, had numerous, honorable and wealthy relations, could be reduced to such distress, was absolutely unaccountable. For had his behaviour corresponded with his birth, education and family, the last of which had many church-livings to bestow, they would not have suffered him to disgrace himself and them by rags and beggary. I therefore had a right to infer, that want in him, was the consequence of demerit, and that his character must be indefensible.

But although I have been dissolute and extravagant, said he, I may nevertheless be qualified to teach the languages, and inculcate morality by my precepts. To this I said, I could not conceive, that a person, who was obliged to pre-construe Cæsar's Commentaries before he heard the scholars, a book as easily to be understood, by a common school-master, as the horn-book is by a village school-mistress, could be enabled to teach Latin as it should be: And that I entertained but little expectations, from the inculcation of morality by the precepts of men whose lives had uniformly shewn their total disregard of it. He then said that Jennings was obliged to pre-construe the books which he taught as well as himself. To which I answered

answered their literary excellence was then in equilibrio, and themselves adapted to advance their scholars to an equal height with their own altitude in learning. Here ended his charge against me, and the discussion of his character.

I then asked him if Jennings was bred at Oxford. He said yes, and that he had taken the degree of bachelor of arts. In what college he studied, and who was his tutor, I then enquired. This, said he, I will not tell you. But I will tell you in what college I studied, and who was my tutor. And why not those of Jennings, I asked, unless he has never studied in that university and dreads a detection of the falsehoods which he hath asserted; or hath committed such transgressions as must cover his character with infamy? To this he made no reply. I then convinced him of two falsehoods which he had uttered, and asked him if he knew of any cause for Jennings's dismissal of the two young gentlemen, whom I mentioned. To this he replied he was not come to justify Mr. Jennings: and then adding, that Robson had desired him to acquaint me that he would not send me the letter which he had promised, he walked off. In justice however to this man, I allow that his temper, his manners, his behaviour and I believe his learning, small as it may be, are superior to those of Jennings.

Since the dismissal of the two young gentlemen, so often mentioned, Jennings hath been extremely assiduous in obviating the ill effects which he apprehended it might produce on his school: and when on his relating the dismissal of my grandson, it was observed, that he had formerly represented me as his best friend, he said it was true. But that such was the disinterestedness of his soul, the liberality of his sentiments, the conditions of his plan and the resolution of preserving the morality

lity, as well as promoting the literary excellence of his scholars, that, despising all pecuniary considerations, and the obligations of friendship, as the misconduct of Master Goodison and my grandson had been so heinous, he had dismissed them.

It was then observed to him, that Mrs. Leckie, and some others had taken their sons from his school on account of his behaviour to the two scholars above mentioned. Still happy in mendacious effrontery, they knew, said he, that I should have dismissed them the next day; and therefore they anticipated me, in order to avert the disgrace of being turned out of my school. In this manner he attempted to confirm the infamy which he had intended to fix on those whom he had causelessly dismissed, and to slander the characters of those whom he would no more have sent away than he will do justice and hang himself. Such was the falacious craft of this renegado in attempting to convert the rascality of his transgression into a persuasion that he had been actuated by the most exalted virtue in the outrage which he had committed. A circumstance which makes it necessary that the parents of those children, which still remain at his school, should be disabused respecting this egregious falacy, and his true character be gibbeted as a warning to all impostors.

Besides the preceding conduct, he has been no less active in reading a letter, from Capt. Le Geyt, to the parents or friends of those boys who are still at his school. The words, or at least the meaning of them, as far as I can learn from my Grandson, who heard them read by Jennings, are, "If any
" boys remain with you, during the holidays, I de-
" sire my son may stay with you, and I will pay
" you what is usual on that account." This, Jennings has considered as a forbiddance of young

Le Geyt's coming to see me, and from thence he has modestly inferred and asserted that this inhibition has been enjoined by the father, because, I had infused into his son a contempt of literary excellence, fostered his youthful passions, and prompted him to acts of disobedience and personal insult. He might as well, and as truly, have inferred and asserted, that I intended to make my grandson a negro and to sell him for a slave to a West India planter. But what inference, more conclusive, can be expected from so flagrant a travestier of common sense, who pretends to teach logic, or the art of reasoning by palpable objects and the feeling? To these scandalous imputations I have already offered such reasons, in my last letter to Jennings, as make it a moral impossibility, that I could have behaved, in the criminal manner he so lyingly asserts, towards my grandson.

This, however, he now in conversation assigns as his reason for dismissing young Le Geyt. To what extremes of ignorance, impudence, falsehood, forgery and improbability is this renegado driven, to condemn, in attempting to exculpate, himself? But let it be supposed, however, that this his lying assertion is truth itself. Why did he then dismiss the son, without previously acquainting the father, with his delinquencies? Why, since his dismissal, has he not assigned some acts of ill conduct, in that son, as causes for that dismissal? Why did he dismiss him to my house, if he believes that I am so execrable a being as to have encouraged him to despise literature and prompted him to immoral acts? Did he intend to ruin him? Are the horrible imputations, of the most criminal principles in me, the reason for Jennings's dismissing Master Goodison also? for he neither has assigned, nor can assign, any another. This Rap, in attempting to
pre-

preserve a character destroys it, as a pig cuts his own throat in swimming to save his life: But I will prove that if he does verily believe what he has asserted respecting me, that he is the most execrable and dangerous miscreant that ever hath presumed to superintend the learning and morality of a school boy. Since his receiving the letter, above-mentioned, from Capt. Le Geyt, he has, without application from me, or opposition from himself, permitted young Le Geyt to come to my house every Saturday, and there to remain till Sunday evening. If Jennings then be really persuaded that I encourage, in my grandson, a contempt of literature and prompt him to vice; why, in contradiction to the inhibition of the father, has this impudent renegado permitted the son to come to me; and villainously sacrificed, both the learning and morality of his scholar, to the sordid advantage of a weekly saving of two dinners and a supper of a school-boy? Jennings therefore is either consciously a liar, when he attempts to depreciate my character, by such acts of criminality; or consciously a scoundrel, in paying no regard to the father's injunction, the learning and morality of the son, his scholar. But I flatter myself that I have already proved him to include both characters so becoming and so laudable in a school-master.

But Capt. Le Geyt will be soon in England. It therefore rests on him to explain what ideas he hath annexed to the words which he hath writtento Jennings, which if he do not I will do myself justice. It will then be seen whether the Rapparee has forged a lye, or spoken the truth. And if the father of Le Geyt has not entirely lost the spirit of a man, he will inflict condign punishment on that renegado who has thus mendaciously affixed a meaning to his words which he hath never conceived; scandalously

attempted to pollute the character of his son by a causeless dismissal; and to calumniate me for having defended him from the ignominious and rascally defamation of that infamous impostor.

Notwithstanding what Trevanion had said, in relation to Robson's intention of not sending me a letter, as I had discovered him in two lyes, whilst he was with me, I was induced to believe that what he had said of Robson was a third. But receiving nothing from Robson, after a few days waiting, I wrote the following letter to him, and inclosing that, and my answer to Jennings, under the same cover, I sent them to Parson's Green.

Sir,

ON Sunday last you promised to transmit me a letter, under your own hand, in confirmation of what you had asserted in the presence of Mrs. Leckie, Mr. Goodison and others, "that there was no cause for dismissing master Goodison, or my grandson and that you never consented to it."

On Tuesday your usher told me, that you had no intention of sending me such a letter. Let me advise you not to proceed in such an intention: but to be uniform in truth and conduct; and not involve yourself in the same criminality with Jennings. For be assured that by uniting yourself, with him in this culpable transaction, you will inevitably be included in the same treatment; lose all appearance of that veracity which you have hitherto shewn; be exposed to the disgrace of refusing to comply with what you have promised; and of obliging me to apply to the persons above-mentioned, at once to evince what you have hitherto affirmed; and your shrinking from giving, under your own hand, what, in justice, you owe

to

to yourself and my grandson. For be assured I will not desist till I have laid the whole of this transaction before the world.

I am, &c.

O^r. 10, 1783.

J. Shebbeare.

On the day of sending these two letters, I was favoured with the following answer from Jennings, but none from Robson. The person who brought it said, that the latter would call on me the next day, or on Sunday; but he never came.

“ Poor old man! determined, in spite of your
“ own sufferings and of the humane advice al-
“ ready given you, to exhaust yourself in the ef-
“ fusions of impotent malignity! Are you inca-
“ pable of knowing that they must be received by
“ persons of conscious worth, with the same con-
“ tempt as the barkings of a sorry cur, which
“ can never annoy, nay, scarce be heard beyond
“ the precincts of his native dunghill. Your pi-
“ tiful attempts at low ridicule will hardly entitle
“ you to my application of Swift’s reply to some
“ such despicable witling as yourself.

“ On me when dotards are satiric,
“ I take it for a panegyric,
“ Hated by fools and fools to hate,
“ Be that my motto, and my fate.

Charles Jennings.

This letter, although I returned no answer to it, for reasons too obvious to escape your observation, I shall, nevertheless, examine in this place. He begins, “ Poor old man!” And happy it is for him that I am an old man, as I have shewn him in my preceding letter. In that also I have given a full answer to his humane advice and
his

his charge of my malignity. From this his sickening return, like a dog to his vomit, to the same stupidity which he had exhibited in his former epistle, it is evinced, he is so consummately a dunce, that he has no more ideas than an oyster, and in his dullness is as much a monotone as the drone of a Scotch bagpipe.

And now for his question. "Are you incapable of knowing that they (the effusions) must be received by persons of conscious worth with the same contempt as the barkings of a sorry cur?" Indeed, I confess I am incapable of knowing that there can be persons of conscious worth; because I cannot conceive how worth can be conscious. He would mean persons conscious of their own worth. But in this he has again stepped into his native bog of blundering nonsense, and has made worth conscious of persons, not persons conscious of worth. After so signal a characteristic of broguish ignorance, will he persevere in the impudence of teaching languages? If such are his palpable blunders in English, what must they be in the ancient and other languages? And if he be conscious of his own worth, I am persuaded that, whoever may read my letters to him, and his to me, will conclude, that he is the only person, on earth, in whom such consciousness can reside. It seems extremely unaccountable also, that he has left that consciousness of his worth to remain in himself alone; and has not endeavoured to make others conscious of it by disproving the truth of what is related in my letter to him. But he is not ignorant of the lost labour in washing black-moors, and has, therefore, declined the fruitless attempt of scouring off the sootiness of his character, and keeps it constantly thereon, as a chimney sweeper does the smut upon his body.

And is not this dereliction of defending his character tantamount to a concession that all that I have written to him is true, and unanswerable? or that he is the most audacious of all two legged animals still to shew his face, if he has the means of refuting it? who is now the cur that is sorry? The Rapparee proceeds. "Which (the cur) can "never annoy, nay, scarce be heard beyond the "precincts of his native dunghill." I cannot help thinking that he is somewhat annoyed; and I will take special care that he shall be heard of much farther than he may imagine. But how long has it been the custom for bitches to litter upon dunghills? Was a dunghill the native spot on which his curship was wheiped? Whether my attempts be pitiful, my ridicule low, and myself a superannuated witling, I shall leave to the determination of you, Sir, and of such as may read his and my letters.

And now for his application of Swift's lines. First of all they were no part of a reply to any one. They were in a letter to Dr. Delany, who was certainly not a dotard. In the first line of them he has made the Dean speak nonsense, by changing the word Duncce for Dotard. Swift could have no desire either to be hated by, or to hate Dotards. They could not have offended him. But such dunces as Jennings, by whom he was then pestered, as I am at present. Jennings, however, to do him justice, conscious of his own worth, and that the word Duncce was so superlatively significant of himself, that it could not be applicable to me, hath changed it for Dotard. And as this act of consciousness seems to be the only white speck of modesty in all the lamp-black of his impudence, I take this occasion of observing it, to shew how friendly I am towards him,

him, whenever I have an opportunity. But I would advise, this Travestier of Swift, not to use the word Fool in his Motto, lest, by the most natural transition, those who may read it, should transfer the idea from the motto to the master. In this manner he hath afforded unexampled instances of his stupidity in converting the wit of Swift into absurdity, both in changing the word Dunce and the application of the lines. For this Renegado is endowed with a quality diametrically opposite to that of Midas. Instead of turning all things into gold that he touches, he transmutes gold into brass and lead. That is, the sterling wit of others into impudence and ignorance in himself. And now, Sir, when you have considered both Jennings's letters and this narrative, I desire you will reflect how perfectly this bombast expositor of his plan is enabled to perform what he so turgidly and so modestly proposes in the following parts of his exposition. And, as he informs us what he shall do, I shall become his commentator, and explain the means by which it is to be effected.

“ But for us,” a writing-master from a day-school and his usher from an advertisement, “ whose principal design, in the course of these lectures, “ is to withdraw, before aspiring genius the sacred curtains of nature and art.” But it so happens that this great man who proposes all the wonderful things in his plan, in applying the word withdraw, proves himself not only ignorant of grammar, but has converted it into nonsense. To withdraw is a verb neuter, and, therefore, to withdraw curtains is an offence to grammar. But, however, let it be received as a verb active, and then to withdraw signifies, to draw back; and thence it follows, that it is their principal design to draw back before aspiring genius the sacred curtains of

nature and art, and thereby to convert the objects of them from aspiring genius. For the accomplishment of which I aver they are most perfectly qualified. He continues, "to trace the improvements of language from the first efforts of rude expression," by the words low-lived, ill-bred, mean fellow, rascal, scoundrel and cowardly dog, "to the last polish of irresistible address," by blunders in grammar, and the polished and brogue pronunciations of harem, charem, warem, farem, &c. "to explain the theory," by rolling words out of his mouth without ideas, as a Savoyard does a tune from a hand-organ without knowing a note of it. "And illustrate the practice of speaking on a more accurate and extensive plan than has hitherto been attempted." By Emphases like the thumps of a fulling-mill, convulsions like the writhings of a goose with its neck just twisted, and with a cadence like the disgusting flavor that runs from an idiot's mouth down his clothes. "We mean to substitute simplicity in the room of declamation," in a bombast style of turgid words, that, like a Dutchman's six pair of breeches, look round and swelling, and cover nothing but what is shameful to be shewn; "and often sacrifice the so flattering praise of elegance to the advantage of perspicuity and exactness," by sacrificing sense to nonsense and using words without annexing ideas, or knowing what they mean. And pray can you tell me, Sir, in what manner the praise of elegance, or even elegance itself can interfere with the advantages of perspicuity and exactness?

He continues "In the course of this reading, the principles of poetry and eloquence will be naturally unfolded." By turning the former into burlesque, and the latter into ridicule, by his manner

manner of action and pronunciation. "The distinctive excellencies of the most celebrated Greek and Latin authors pointed out and contrasted with the most critical nicety," By Charles Jennings, who is obliged daily to learn the lessons he presumes to teach, in those languages, before he hears his scholars. And by the critical nicety of travestying the sublime into a burlesque contrast. "The young student's emulation roused." By knocking him down. "And all his native powers of genius called forth," Whether he has genius or not by a man who has none. "Exercised, invigorated, and expanded to the utmost stretch of possible perfection." By his mutton fist. O rare Charles Jennings. "By frequent attempts not only to transfuse in English versions, the spirit of those divine writers, with undiminished grace and energy" in a language he does not understand. "But also to exhibit, in imitative essays, their most striking beauties, reproduced, as it were with a noble intermixture of rival originality." By similes like the scorpion, and metaphors like the nauseous draught of grammar jargon, in a style of pomposity and fustian without ideas, and in the deformed imagery of his exposition. Besides should not "Transfusing in English versions," Be into English versions, to make it grammar?

To the preceding boastings of what he will perform in polite literature, he adds, "And as palpable objects, where they can be introduced, are always more expressive than the clearest precepts, the properties of quantity shall be explained, and logic, or the art of reasoning, practically inculcated by a demonstration of Euclid's Elements." From this passage it is evident, that eye-sight is not necessary in Jennings's method of teaching logic,

logic. It is to be done by palpable objects, or by touching. If this be the case, he must either intend to have triangles, squares, circles, polygons, and other geometrical figures made in brass, wood, or some other such tangible material; or be enabled to make the boys to feel the lines and figures of Euclid's diagrams on paper. And this I believe he can as perfectly accomplish, as he can teach the languages. This is, however, most certainly the first instance of attempting to teach logic, or the art of reasoning, by the touch. Wonders! Wonders! Wonders! by the wonderful Charles Jennings, the Katterfelto of all pedagogues, and his black cat Trevanion.

And now as he may probably expect a return in poetry to his travesty of Swift, I shall give him one from Butler, and leave you to decide whether it be less apposite to him than his to me.

The diff'rence is so small, his brain
 Outweighs his rage but half a grain.
 Besides, 'tis known he can speak Greek,
 As naturally as pigs do squeak,
 That Latin is no more difficile,
 Than for a blackbird it's to whistle.
 Being rich in both, he ne'er doth scant
 His bounty unto such as want,
 But much of either doth afford,
 To many that have not one word.
 For rhetoric he cannot ope
 His mouth, but out there flies a trope:
 And when he's pleas'd to shew't, his speech
 In loftiness of sound is rich.
 A Babylonish dialect,
 Which learned pedants much affect.
 It is a party-colour'd dress
 Of patched and pye-palled languages,
 'Tis English, cut on Greek and Latin,
 Like fustian heretofore on fatten,
 It has an odd promiscuous tone,
 As if he talk'd three parts in one;

This

This he as volubly can vent,
 As if his stock could ne'er be spent.
 And truly to support that charge,
 He hath supplies as vast and large.
 For he can coin, or counterfeit
 New words with little or no wit.
 Words so debased and hard, no stone
 Is hard enough to touch them on.
 And when with hasty noise he speaks them,
 The ignorant for current take them.
 A second Thomas, or at once,
 To name them all, another dunce.

Having advanced thus far in this narrative, I
 unexpectedly received the following letter from
 Robson.

Sir,

I Thought to have had an opportunity of seeing
 you in Eaton Street, or I should have written
 sooner. My meaning must have been very much
 misconceived by Mrs. Leckie and Mr. Goodison to
 suppose I said any thing in their company that
 could tend to justify master Le Geyt's conduct.
 On the contrary, I told Mr. Goodison, when he
 requested me to write Mr. Le Geyt's name with
 his sons, that I thought it of late very censurable.
 I nevertheless blame Mr. Jennings for being so
 much irritated at it as to dismiss him. When
 any thing of this kind becomes unavoidable, it
 is no doubt, highly necessary to give some pre-
 vious formal intimation of it to the young gentle-
 mens friends.

I must take the liberty of acquainting you, Sir,
 that a strict adherence to truth puts it out of my
 power farther to comply with your request: As to
 your menaces, I must suppose your good sense and
 discretion will prevent your attempting to involve
 me in any thing that may prove injurious to me.

The

The whole of this business has been contrary to my inclination, and though I wish gratefully to acknowledge all past favours, yet, I find it necessary to use every precaution to put it out of every persons power to ruin me.

Your's, &c.

T. Robson.

October, 15, 1783.

This letter I consider as chiefly to be ascribed to Jennings, who applies Robson to his purposes and emolument, as Katterfelto does his guinea-pig in his air-pump. This epistle of this adherent to truth does manifestly begin with a most atrocious falsehood. Trevanion assured me he was desired by Robson to tell me that he intended no such letter. This I mention in my letter to Robson, as the cause of writing to him, to which Robson offers no contradiction; but says, he should have written sooner had he not thought to have an opportunity of seeing me. Both these assertions cannot be true. I therefore leave these worthies to settle the lye between them, which is lye the first. But in justice to Trevanion I must say I believe that Robson is the liar. For the very Saturday on which, as he had sent me word that he would see me, he drank tea at a gentleman's house opposite the bun-house in Chelsea, which is but a small distance from Eaton Street. He, therefore, at that time, had an opportunity; and this is lye the second. In like manner having this opportunity the want of it could not have prevented him from writing sooner, and this is lye the third.

He next says, "his meaning must have been very much misconceived by Mrs. Leckie and Mr. Goodison to suppose he had said any thing, in their company, that could tend to justify Master Le Geyt.

Geyt. The words he pronounced are inserted in my letters to him and Jennings, which were, " That there was no cause for dismissing Master Goodison and Master Le Geyt, and that he never consented to it." These words I then heard, as well as the persons abovementioned. Does he mean one thing and say another? What other meaning can these words possibly convey, but that there was no cause for their dismissal? Is he not, therefore, most atrociously audacious to say, that his meaning was very much misconceived by Mrs. Leckie and Mr. Goodison, to suppose that he said any thing that could tend to justify master Le Geyt, when it was impossible the words could have been misconceived or have another tendency? And I will soon evince, from what he hath given under his own hand, that the words conveyed the precise meaning he intended. This therefore is lye the fourth, together with a prevarication as scandalous as lying itself, in order to evade the charge, of having said that which he dare not to deny, as by his asserting that his meaning was very much misconceived, although his words could not possibly convey another meaning.

He then adds on the contrary that he told Mr. Goodison, when he required him " To write Mr. Le Geyt's name with his sons that he thought " Le Geyt's conduct very censurable." Why then did he say at first there was no cause for his dismissal, as well as when he came from Mr. Goodison's? Why did Jennings and he neglect to give instances of this very censurable conduct in their letters? Would they have omitted it had any such conduct existed? Have they adduced the most minute pretext in defence of the rascality of Jennings? I assert also from Mr. Goodison that Rob-

son said nothing of Le Geyt's very censurable conduct.

But let the writing speak for itself which he gave to Mr. Goodison? " I cannot help acquainting you
 " how extremely sorry I am for Master Goodison's
 " leaving the school. My partner's precipitate
 " behaviour in this affair is exceedingly censurable
 " in discharging your son without any just cause,
 " and I assure you meets with my disapprobation.
 " Believe me, Sir, to be grateful for past favours."

Your's, &c.

October, 3, 1783.

T. Robson.

" P. S. I think it unnecessary to remind you
 " that Master Goodison's behaviour, while with
 " us, has been such as becomes a gentleman.
 " However, for your farther satisfaction, it may be
 " acceptable to say, Master Le Geyt's dismissal,
 " and the other young Gentlemen who have left
 " the school in consequence of that business, I am
 " sorry for."

T. R.

Here then Robson gives the lye to his saying that his meaning had been misconceived. For now he directly says there was no just cause for dismissing Master Goodison. Did he make any distinction between him and Le Geyt when he at first said there was no cause for the dismissal of either of them. And if the conduct of the latter had been so very censurable, would he have been sorry for the dismissal of so censurable a boy, and have placed him on an equal footing in his sorrow with those who had left the school uncensurable and undismitted? This very censurable conduct is therefore lye the fifth, and that he mentioned it to Mr. Goodison is lye the sixth, and now pray attend to the rascally pervarication of this Robson, whose intellect and veracity

racity are as lame as his body, and in a worse condition, because they have no crutch to support them. " When any thing of this kind becomes unaviodable, it is no doubt highly necessary to give some previous formal intimation of it to the young gentlemen's friends." By the stating it hypothetically, when any thing of this kind becomes unavoidable, he would have it believed it was so on this occasion, and that the criminality of Jennings did not consist in the dismissal, but in his not pre-acquainting Mr. Goodison and me with his intention before it was done. But what can this ignominious subterfuge avail, since he, and his colleague in falsehood, have not been able to assign a single cause for the dismissal of Le Geyt or one instance of his censurable conduct? But I will assist him here, as I have his Katterfelto on the same occasion, respecting the unavoidableness of the dismissal. He knew his ignorance, impudence, imposture and inadequateness to the duty of a school-master had not escaped the animadversion of Goodison and Le Geyt. He feared they would discover them to Mr. Goodison and me, and was confident they would be, on that account, withdrawn from his school. He therefore preferred the criminality of a rascally dismissal by himself, to their being taken away by their friends on the account of his preceding disqualifications.

And now he says " He must take the liberty of acquainting me, that a strict adherence to truth puts it out of his power further to comply with my request." What an infamous pretension of adhering to truth is this in a man who hath given so many instances of lying in this very letter. This adherence is lye the seventh.

He proceeds, " As to my menaces he must suppose my good sense and discretion will prevent

“ my attempting to involve him in any thing that
 “ may prove injurious to him.” I must be totally
 void of sense and discretion if I desist from shewing
 these fellows in their true light. It is he who has
 involved himself in the same criminality with Jen-
 nings, and I will stick to them both like the dread
 of hell to a Nabob’s conscience until I do justice
 to Master Goodison, my grandson and myself.

He continues “ The whole of this business has
 “ been very contrary to his inclinations, and
 “ though he wishes perfectly to acknowledge all
 “ past favours, yet he finds it necessary to use every
 “ precaution to put it out of any person’s power to
 “ ruin him.” And as this precaution consists
 solely in lyes and prevarications; by deserting the
 veracity with which he began, and by linking
 himself to Jennings, that lump of lead, he will be
 as surely carried to the bottom of perdition, as a
 mouse tied to a mill stone and thrown into the sea
 will be sunk to the bottom of it.

And now, Sir, I have given you a faithful nar-
 rative of the dismissal of the two young gentle-
 men, and the behaviour of those pedagogues to
 me. In this I have undoubtedly evinced that my
 want of precaution and judgment, in selecting
 these men, as Schoolmasters to my grandson, and
 in recommending them to others, have deservedly
 drawn on me a just imputation of absurd credulity
 and defective understanding. But if I am to be con-
 sidered as the decoy-duck that has led you, Sir,
 and other parents into this snare, I intreat you to
 reflect that, contrary to the usual event in such
 cases, I have not only suffered equally with those
 whom I have seduced, but have exerted myself to
 set them free again, and stop the progress of the
 mischief before it becomes too late.

And

And now, having concluded this long narrative, I leave it to be disposed of as you please, and take my leave of the wonders, wonders, wonders of this wonderful trio of animals the Katterfelto, his black cat, and guinea-pig.

I am, &c.

OCT. 24, 1783,

J. Shebbeare.

P. S. Since the preceding narrative has been written, I have from unquestionable authority, a right to say, that Dr. Scott "is not acquainted with any gentleman of the name of Jennings; that if he has taken a degree at University College, it must have been since he left it: he has not the slightest recollection of having had a pupil of that name, nor does he at present know any person whom he belongs to."

From this account I make no doubt that Jennings is an Irish Papist, and was bred in some seminary on the continent, neither of which could have tended to his disgrace had he not become the renegado of his country, and the smuggler of his religion; characteristics that depreciate the man who is cursed with them, to the most contemptible state of human depravity and aversion.

F I N I S.

And now, having concluded this long narrative, I have to be obliged to you for the and take my leave of the wonders, wonders, wonders of this wonderful world of nature, the Kitchikan, the black cat, and Kitchikan.

I am, Sir,

Yr. Obedt. Servant

GR. 22. 11. 23.

P. 2. Since the preceding narrative has been written, I have from respectable authority a right to say that Dr. Scott is not so "quarantined with any gentleman of the name of Jennings; that it is a known degree of University College, it may have been that he felt it to be not the best of his recollection of having had a pupil of the name; nor does he at present know any person whom he brings "10."

From this account I now conclude that Jennings is an Irishman, and was born in some of the many on the continent, none of which could have tended to his education, and become the teacher of his country, and the teacher of his religion; characteristics that denote the man who is connected with them, to the most complete state of human depravity and servitude.